Case 1:13-cr-00478-JGK Document 56 Filed 01/09/14 Page 1 of 37 1

Dc4dcasp	
Plea	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
x	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
V.	S2 13 Cr. 0478 (JGK)
HARRY CASTRO,	
Defendant.	
x	
	December 4, 2013 5:06 a.m.
Before:	
HON. JOHN G. KOE	ELTL,
	District Judge
APPEARANCES	
United States Attorney for the	
BY: DAMIAN WILLIAMS	
Attorneys for Defendant BY: PEGGY CROSS-GOLDENBERG	
	Plea UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

23

24

25

Plea 1 THE CLERK: United States of America versus Harry 2 Castro. 3 All parties, please states who they are for the 4 record. MR. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, your Honor. Damian 5 6 Williams for the government. 7 THE COURT: Good afternoon. MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: And the Federal Defenders of 8 9 New York by Peggy Cross-Goldenberg for Mr. Castro. 10 Good afternoon, your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon. 11 12 I understand that the defendant has an application. 13 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor. 14 A Superseding Indictment has been filed in this case. 15 He has not actually been arraigned on that indictment, but we have reached an agreement by which the government will accept a 16 plea to a lesser included charge. Mr. Castro is prepared to 17 18 plead guilty to that lesser included charge at this time. So I don't know if the Court actually wants to arraign 19 20 him first or if he can just enter the plea of quilty to the 21 lesser included charge. 22 THE COURT: What I would like to do -- what I usually

do, if the parties agree, is I would incorporate the arraignment on the Superseding Indictment together with the allocution on the guilty plea. And that has always made more

Plea

sense to me because somehow it doesn't seem quite right to me to simply arraign the defendant on a Superseding Indictment and receive a plea of not guilty and then move to an allocution on a guilty plea, particularly when the allocution on the guilty plea goes through all of the questions to make sure that the defendant is competent to plead, and he has done that after he has just entered a plea of not guilty on the Superseding Indictment.

So it makes more sense to incorporate the arraignment on the Superseding Indictment together with the allocution on a guilty plea to the Superseding Indictment, if the parties agree with that.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, I indeed do, your Honor. In fact, I describe the other procedure as the kind of thing that gives lawyers a bad name because it doesn't make sense to me either. So I think the government is OK with that process also.

THE COURT: Is that OK?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And the plea is pursuant to a plea agreement, right?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: I have a November 26, 2013 letter from the government to you, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg. It's signed by Mr. Williams and Ms. Dabbs. It appears to be signed by

Plea Mr. Castro and yourself on December 4th of 2013. The letter is 1 2 dated November 26, 2013. 3 Is that the plea agreement? MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: OK. I have marked that as Court Exhibit 5 6 1. 7 Mr. Fletcher, please administer the oath to the defendant. 8 9 THE CLERK: Counsel has asked that the defendant can 10 be seated for medical reasons. 11 THE COURT: Fine. The defendant can be seated. 12 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor. 13 (The defendant was sworn) 14 THE CLERK: Please state your name for the record. 15 THE DEFENDANT: Harry Castro. 16 THE COURT: You can be seated. 17 Thank you. THE DEFENDANT: 18 THE COURT: Mr. Castro, do you understand that you are 19 now under oath and that if you answer any of my questions 20 falsely, your false or untrue answers may later be used against 21 you in another prosecution for perjury or making a false 2.2 statement?

23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

24

25

THE COURT: Tell me your full name, please.

THE DEFENDANT: My name is Harry Castro.

Case 1:13-cr-00478-JGK Document 56 Filed 01/09/14 Page 5 of 37

Dc4dcasp Plea 1 THE COURT: How old are you? THE DEFENDANT: 2 59. 3 THE COURT: How far did you go in school? 4 THE DEFENDANT: I have a bachelor's degree. 5 THE COURT: Are you a citizen of the United States? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am. 7 THE COURT: Are you able to speak and understand 8 English? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, I am. 10 THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been 11 under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. 13 THE COURT: Tell me about that, please. 14 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'm currently in treatment for 15 depression and anxiety and attention deficit disorder. THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about those 16 17 conditions that interferes with your ability to understand 18 these proceedings and to consult with your lawyer? THE DEFENDANT: No, there is not. 19 20 THE COURT: Do you take medication for those 21 conditions? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 23 THE COURT: What kind of medication do you take? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Antianxiety pills, antidepressants, 25 and also for attention deficit disorder, I also take medication octacasp

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plea

for that as well. I believe my attorney has a list of the medications.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: I do have a list of his medications, your Honor, I can hand up to the Court.

Mr. Castro also suffers from some physical ailments.

I don't know if the Court wants to inquire about those but --

THE COURT: Sure. What physical ailments?

And you can then read me the medications after Mr. Castro goes through the physical conditions also for which he sees a doctor.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I suffer from cancer, prostate cancer. I have been undergoing treatment for that, as well as AIDS-related conditions.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you. Is there anything about those conditions that interferes with your ability to understand these proceedings and consult with your lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: Not at this time.

THE COURT: OK. And, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, you said you have a list of the defendant's medications. Do you wand to read them for the record?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Sure, your Honor. If the Court would like, I provided a list to the court reporter so he will have the spelling, and to the government.

But his medications are Lorazepam, Ritalin, Norvir, Reyataz, Truvada, Risperdal, Zovirax and Celexa. There may be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plea

a couple of others that he doesn't take on a regular basis, but we have discussed whether any of them affect his ability to understand and follow these proceedings and they do not.

THE COURT: Is that right, Mr. Castro?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: So there is nothing about any of those medications that interferes with your ability to understand these proceedings and to consult with your lawyer, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. Have you ever been treated or hospitalized for any mental illness or any type of addiction, including drug or alcohol addiction?

You've seen a doctor, I appreciate, for depression and ADD.

THE DEFENDANT: No, I haven't.

THE COURT: Other than that, have you ever been treated or hospitalized for any mental illness or any type of addiction, including drug or alcohol addiction?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I have not.

THE COURT: OK. Now, in the past 24 hours, have you taken any drugs, medicine or pills, or have you drunk any alcohol?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Is it some of the medication that you have

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plea

1 described to me?

THE DEFENDANT: That is right.

THE COURT: Is there anything about that medication

that interferes with your ability to understand these

proceedings or to consult with your lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: No, there aren't.

THE COURT: Is your mind clear today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you feeling all right today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do either counsel have any doubt as to the defendant's competence to waive indictment, agree to proceed by information -- I'm sorry.

Do either counsel have any doubt as to the defendant's competence to plead at this time?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Castro,

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg has informed me that you wish to enter a plea of guilty to the Superseding Indictment. Is that what you wish to do?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you had a full opportunity to discuss your case with Ms. Cross-Goldenberg and to discuss the consequences of entering a plea of guilty?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plea

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg and her representation of you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. Castro's responses to my questions and my observations of his demeanor, I find that he is fully competent to enter an informed plea at this time.

Now, Mr. Castro, before I accept any plea from you,
I'm going to be asking you various questions. My questions are
intended to satisfy me that you wish to plead guilty because
you are in fact guilty and that you fully understand the
consequences of your plea and, furthermore, that you are
pleading guilty knowingly and voluntarily and that there is an
independent basis in fact for your plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am now going to describe to you certain rights that you have under the Constitution and laws of the United States which rights you will be giving up if you enter a plea of guilty. Please listen to me very carefully. If there is anything that I say that you don't understand, please ask me to stop. Either I or Ms. Cross-Goldenberg will explain it to you more fully. All right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Castro, under the Constitution

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Plea

and laws of the United States, you have a right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you which are contained in the Superseding Indictment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would be presumed to be innocent, and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. You would not have to prove that you were innocent at trial.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, a jury composed of 12 people selected from this district would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to be represented by a lawyer, and if you could not afford a lawyer, a lawyer would be provided to you free of cost.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: In fact, Mr. Castro, you have a right to be represented by a lawyer at trial and at every other stage of

Plea

the proceedings, and if you cannot afford a lawyer, a lawyer would be provided to you free of cost.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to see and hear all of the witnesses against you, and your attorney could cross-examine them. You would have a right to have your attorney object to the government's evidence and offer evidence on your behalf, if you so desired. And you would have the right to have subpoenas issued or other compulsory process used to compel witnesses to testify in your defense. And you would not be required to testify.

Do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Castro, if there were a trial, you would have the right to testify if you wanted to, but no one could force you to testify if you didn't want to. And, furthermore, no inference or suggestion of guilt could be drawn if you chose not to testify at trial.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Castro, do you understand each and every one of the rights that I've described to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions about any of

Plea

1 | those rights?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that by entering a plea of guilty today, you are giving up each and every one of those rights, that you are waiving those rights, and that you will have no trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you can change your mind right now and refuse to enter a plea of guilty? You don't have to enter this plea if you don't want to for any reason at all. Do you understand that completely?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Castro, you've received a copy of the Superseding Indictment against you, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you read it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Do you understand what you are charged with in the Superseding Indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you want me to -- actually, I'm going to read the Superseding Indictment aloud to you in open court, in any event, because I want to assure myself that you

Plea

understand what you are charged with in the Superseding

Indictment and what the government would be required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Superseding Indictment is the United States of America against Harry Castro, James Halsey IV, John Cantwell, the defendants:

"Count One

"The Grand Jury charges:

"From at least in or about 2012 up to and including in or about February 2013, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, Harry Castro, James Halsey IV and John Cantwell, the defendants, and others known and unknown, intentionally and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate and agree together and with each other to violate the narcotics laws of the United States.

"It was a part and an object of the conspiracy that Harry Castro, James Halsey IV and John Cantwell, the defendants, and others known and unknown, would and did distribute and possess with intent to distribute a controlled substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 841(a)(1).

"The controlled substance involved in the offense was 50 grams and more of methamphetamine, its salts, isomers, and salts of its isomers, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 841(b)(1)(A), in violation of Title 21, United

States Code, Section 846."

And then there is a forfeiture allegation.

"As a result of committing the offense charged in Count One of this Indictment, Harry Castro, James Halsey IV and John Cantwell, the defendants, shall forfeit to the United States, pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853, any and all property constituting or derived from any proceeds the defendants obtained directly or indirectly as a result of the offense and any and all property used or intended to be used in any manner or part to commit and to facilitate the commission of the offense charged in Count One of this Indictment.

"Substitute Assets Provision

"If any of the above-described forfeitable property, as a result of any act or omission of Harry Castro, James Halsey IV and John Cantwell, the defendants:

"a. cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;

"b. has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third person;

"c. has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the Court;

"d. has been substantially diminished in value; or

"e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be subdivided without difficulty,

"it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. Section 853(p), to seek forfeiture of any other property of the defendants up to the value of the above forfeitable property.

"(Title 21, United States Code, Section 853.)"

The Superseding Indictment is signed by the Foreperson and Preet Bharara, the United States Attorney.

So, do you understand, Mr. Castro, that is what you are charged with in the Superseding Indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: OK. Do you understand that if you did not plead guilty, the government would be required to prove each and every part or element of the charge against you beyond a reasonable doubt at trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand that.

THE COURT: Do you understand that at trial, the government would be required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, first, the existence of the conspiracy charged in the indictment, that is, an agreement or understanding to violate those provisions of the law that make it illegal to distribute narcotics or possess narcotics with the intent to distribute them; second, that you, the defendant, knowingly became a member of the conspiracy, that is, that you knowingly associated yourself with the conspiracy and participated in the conspiracy to distribute or possess with the intent to

Plea

distribute narcotics; and, finally, that the narcotics involved in the conspiracy was methamphetamine? Do you understand that the government would be required to prove all of that beyond a reasonable doubt at trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And in describing to you the elements of the offense, I have taken into account that you are pleading guilty to a lesser included offense than the one that is actually charged in the Indictment. So in listing the elements of the offense, I have listed that the narcotics involved in the conspiracy was methamphetamine rather than any specific amount of methamphetamine, because that's a lesser included charge than the one that's actually in the Indictment, which alleges that the narcotics involved in the conspiracy was 50 grams or more of methamphetamine.

So to prove the lesser included offense, the government would be required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt at trial only that the narcotics involved in the conspiracy was methamphetamine.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: OK. Now, with respect to the lesser included offense, to which the parties advise you are pleading

Plea

guilty, do you understand that the maximum term of imprisonment is 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum term of lifetime supervised release, and a mandatory minimum term of three years' supervised release, a fine of the greatest of \$1 million or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than yourself as a result of the offense, and a \$100 mandatory special assessment? Do you understand that is the maximum penalty for the crime to which you are entering a plea of guilty as well as the mandatory minimum term of supervised release?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that when I talk about "supervised release," supervised release means that you will be subject to monitoring when you are released from prison and that the monitoring is to be under terms and conditions which could lead to reimprisonment without a jury trial if you violate them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you understand that if you violated the terms of supervised release and were sentenced to prison, you could be sentenced to prison for the entire term of supervised release without any credit for any time you had already spent on supervised release?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that as part of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plea

your sentence, I can also order restitution to any person injured as a result of your criminal conduct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In reading the Indictment to you, I read the forfeiture allegation in the Indictment. So do you understand that as part of your sentence I can also order forfeiture?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Castro, do you understand that if I accept your quilty plea and adjudge you quilty, that adjudication may deprive you of valuable civil rights such as the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury, and the right to possess any kind of firearm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Castro, under current law there are Sentencing Guidelines that judges must consult in determining your sentence. You have spoken to your lawyer about the Sentencing Guidelines, haven't you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Do you understand that I, as the sentencing Court, will not be able to determine your guideline sentencing range until the Probation Department has completed a presentence report and after you and your lawyer and the government have had an opportunity to review that report, to

Plea

challenge anything contained in the report, and then to speak on your behalf — well and after you, your lawyer and the government have had an opportunity to file any objections to the presentence report and after I have had an opportunity to consider those objections? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you also understand that even after it is determined what the basic guideline sentencing range is that applies in your case, I have the authority in some circumstances to depart upward or downward from the sentence that is otherwise called for by the guidelines? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And even after that guidelines' sentencing range is determined, taking into account any upward or downward departures, I must then look to various statutory factors to make a final determination of what the appropriate and reasonable sentence is in your case.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if you are sentenced to prison, parole has been abolished and you will not be released any earlier on parole?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if your lawyer or

anyone else has attempted to estimate or predict what your sentence will be, that their estimate or prediction could be wrong?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: No one, Mr. Castro -- not your lawyer, not the government -- no one can or should give you any assurance of what your sentence will be since that sentence can only be determined after the Probation Department has completed the presentence report, after I have ruled on any challenges to the report, and after I have determined what the appropriate and reasonable sentence is in your case.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And do you also understand that even if your sentence is different from what your lawyer or anyone else told you that it might be, or if it's different from what you expect it to be, you will still be bound by your guilty plea and you will not be allowed to withdraw your plea of guilty?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Castro, I have been given the plea agreement, which you heard me talk about at the outset with your lawyer. It is a November 26, 2013 letter to Ms. Cross-Goldenberg from the government, which appears to be signed by you and Ms. Cross-Goldenberg today, December the 4th.

Dc4dcasp Plea It's marked as Court Exhibit 1. 1 2 Have you signed this plea agreement? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. 4 THE COURT: Did you read the agreement before you 5 signed it? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did. 7 THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your lawyer before 8 you signed it? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did. 10 THE COURT: Did you fully understand the agreement 11 before you signed it? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 13 THE COURT: Does this letter agreement constitute your 14 complete and total understanding of the entire agreement 15 between the government, your lawyer, and you? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 17 THE COURT: Is everything that you understand about 18 your plea and your sentence contained in this plea agreement? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Has anything been left out? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Not to my knowledge, no. 22 THE COURT: Has anyone offered you any inducements or 23

threatened you or forced you to plead quilty or to enter into this plea agreement?

> THE DEFENDANT: No.

24

25

THE COURT: There is a provision of the plea agreement that provides: It is agreed that the defendant will not file a direct appeal nor bring a collateral challenge, including, but not limited to, an application under Title 28, United States Code, Section 2255 and/or Section 2241, nor seek a sentence modification pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3582(c) of any sentence within or below the stipulated guidelines' range of 37 to 46 months' imprisonment even if the Court denies the defendant's application for safety valve relief.

So do you understand, Mr. Castro, that if I sentence you to 46 months' imprisonment, or less, you had given up your right to appeal or otherwise challenge any such sentence in any proceeding, including any habeas corpus proceeding? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that the Court is not bound by the plea agreement or by any of the provisions or stipulations in the plea agreement? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the Court must make an independent determination of the appropriate sentence in your case, and even if that sentence differs from anything that's contained in the plea agreement, you will still be bound by your guilty plea and you will not be allowed to withdraw

25

Plea 1 your plea of guilty? Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, do you know of any 4 valid defense that would prevail at the trial of Mr. Castro? MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: Do you know of any reason that Mr. Castro 7 should not be permitted to plead guilty? 8 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Castro, tell me what you did in 10 connection with the offense to which you are entering a plea of 11 quilty. 12 THE DEFENDANT: In February of 2013, I agreed with 13 others to sell methamphetamine. 14 I know it was wrong and I -- I am advised that it was 15 wrong, and I am very sorry for that. 16 THE COURT: All right. Did you do any act or, to your 17 knowledge, did any of your co-conspirators do any act in 18 Manhattan or the Bronx or Westchester to further the conspiracy 19 to sell methamphetamine? 20 THE DEFENDANT: To my knowledge, just in Manhattan. 21 THE COURT: You did something in Manhattan? 22 THE DEFENDANT: It was in Manhattan, correct, your 23 Honor. 24 THE COURT: OK. What did you do in Manhattan?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I agreed to sell methamphetamine

Plea

1 | with others.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You entered into the agreement in Manhattan?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. And when you did these acts, did you know that what you were doing was wrong and illegal?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You can talk to your lawyer. Do you have any question about that?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't.

THE COURT: So when you did these acts, did you know that what you were doing was wrong and illegal?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Does the government want me to ask any other questions of the defendant?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Tell me what the government's evidence would be at trial.

MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, the government would offer both law enforcement and testimony from a confidential informant, among others, about the events that led to the arrest back in February of 2013. Furthermore, there is physical evidence of drug trafficking, including scales and methamphetamine that was seized on the day of the arrest and subsequent to the arrest.

24

25

Plea THE COURT: OK. 1 MR. WILLIAMS: And that would prove beyond a 2 3 reasonable doubt that the crimes charged in the Indictment were 4 in fact committed. THE COURT: By this defendant? 5 6 MR. WILLIAMS: Correct, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: OK. Mr. Castro, how do you plead to the 8 charge against you in Count One of the Superseding Indictment, 9 quilty or not quilty? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty. 11 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty because you are in 12 fact quilty? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am. 14 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of your own free will? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am. 17 THE COURT: Before I finally accept the defendant's 18 plea, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, do you want me to ask any other 19 questions of the defendant? 20 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor. Thank you. 21 THE COURT: Do you know of any reason that I should 22 not accept his plea? 23 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Williams, before I finally accept the defendant's plea, does the government want me to ask any other

questions of the defendant?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government know of any reason that I should not accept his plea?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Castro, because you acknowledge that you are guilty as charged in Count One of the Superseding Indictment, because I find that you know your rights and are waiving them knowingly and voluntarily, because I find that your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offense, I accept your guilty plea, and I adjudge you guilty of the offense to which you have pleaded.

Mr. Castro, the Probation Department will now prepare the presentence report to assist me in sentencing you. You will be interviewed by the Probation Department. It is very important that the information you provide to the Probation Department be truthful and accurate. The presentence report is very important to me in my decision as to what your sentence will be. You and your lawyer will have the opportunity to review the presentence report, to challenge anything contained in the report, and then to speak on your behalf at sentencing.

THE CLERK: March 14, 10 o'clock.

THE COURT: How about March 14th at 10 a.m.?

Plea

	Plea
1	MR. WILLIAMS: That is fine for the government, your
2	Honor.
3	MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: That's fine with us, your
4	Honor. Thank you.
5	THE COURT: OK. Sentencing March 14th, 2014, at
6	10 a.m.
7	What is the bail status of the defendant?
8	MR. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry, your Honor?
9	THE COURT: What is the bail status of the defendant?
10	MR. WILLIAMS: The defendant is on bail, your Honor.
11	MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: He was released, your Honor, on
12	a \$10,000 personal recognizance bond cosigned by one of his
13	brothers. I have a copy of the bond if the Court wants to see
14	it.
15	He has been fully complying with all of his bail
16	conditions since his release in February, and we would ask that
17	they continue.
18	THE COURT: OK. Any other applications with respect
19	to bail?
20	MR. WILLIAMS: Not from the government.
21	THE COURT: Isn't this
22	MR. WILLIAMS: I don't know if it is presumptively
23	mandatory
24	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
25	MR. WILLIAMS: I don't know if remand is presumptively

Plea

1 mandatory.

THE COURT: You don't?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, in light of the whole -- even if the government were seeking remand, I think there are exceptional circumstances here.

THE COURT: Yes. OK. First.

(Pause)

OK. The government is not seeking remand.

Is it a mandatory case? Yes, it appears to be a mandatory case. The offense is under the Controlled Substances Act. The sentence -- the maximum term of imprisonment is ten years or more.

Is there a safety valve? Yes, for exceptional circumstances.

The parties should certainly have addressed this prior to the entry of the guilty plea.

I make it a practice that, you know, if a defendant should — a defendant should not be unadvised of what the statute provides, and the government should give the advice, counsel should give the advice, and the Court has an obligation to follow the statute not only in those cases where the government wants to remand but the government should be following a policy that it follows the statute, and so it should be not selecting among defendants but, rather, following the statute. And I had thought that had become the government

policy after issues developed over the selective use of that provision. And the Court of Appeals has plainly said, you know, that exceptional circumstances are limited.

Now, based on this case, this may be a case of exceptional circumstances based on the defendant's physical condition, if nothing else. What would exceptional circumstances be? Exceptional circumstances may include a situation where the Court at the time of sentence may not impose a sentence of imprisonment because if the Court were not to impose a sentence of imprisonment, sending the defendant to prison pending sentence would not be reasonable, and that is plainly an exceptional circumstance if the Court in good faith believes that that's a possibility. But, on the other hand, if it were clear that the defendant were going to be sentenced to prison, then it would be difficult to say that this is a case of exceptional circumstances.

My observations, after listening to the defendant and observing the defendant, is there is a possibility, despite the fact that the parties have a plea agreement which says that the there is a guidelines' sentencing range — not binding on the Court — which provides for a term of imprisonment. But I'll certainly listen to an argument that this is a case of exceptional circumstances. And, you know, if I thought that there were an insufficient showing of exceptional circumstances, I wouldn't remand a defendant who had no advice

with respect to that before coming into court; I would simply put it over.

So, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

I can address what I think are the exceptional circumstances. I have some materials which have been provided to the government before we came today regarding Mr. Castro's health, and I am happy to go into those as well.

THE COURT: Did you anticipate this as an issue, or not? Or don't you want me to ask?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, this is a case where I think that there clearly are exceptional circumstances, and so I am hopeful that the Court will agree with me. And I think, you know, the way that the Court phrased the issue I think is a very good way to look at it. And I think there are two reasons — two sort of categories of reasons why it is likely that there may not be a jail term imposed in this case at all.

The first is the sort of categorical circumstances in which we find ourselves which resulted in this plea agreement to begin with. And I think -- I don't want to speak for Mr. Williams' office, but to the extent that there is a policy of seeking remand at this stage of a case, I think that the Holder memo and the position that the Attorney General has taken with respect to first offenders in nonviolent, smalltime

drug cases and the reasons why imprisonment is not a good policy in those cases, I know that's what led to the plea to the lesser included charge here as a mechanism of relieving this case from the mandatory minimum framework. Right?

So I think categorically that is a signal from the Department of Justice that there are cases, despite what the guidelines may recommend, where jail is not appropriate in first-time, you know, low-level, nonviolent drug offenses, and that is the kind of case that we have right now.

I think that the statute clearly has not caught up with that, but I think that the signal from the Justice

Department and from the Attorney General, it's obviously been an issue that's been brewing for years and certainly first in the crack cocaine realm but sentences have been ameliorated over time, but this really is a sea change that constitutes an exceptional circumstance and that I think in light of the facts of this case make it likely that a jail sentence will not be imposed.

And I'm not presuming what the Court will do, and I don't mean to speak for your Honor, but I think the Court used the word "reasonable," right? That it's, I think, reasonable on these facts to think that there may be a non-jail sentence thereby making remand at this stage unreasonable.

So that is the sort of general point with respect to this kind of case and this kind of plea agreement.

With respect to Mr. Castro in particular, your Honor, he mentioned to the Court some of his health conditions. And I'm going to run through some things, and if the Court wants documentation, then I would ask that we put it off and come back --

THE COURT: No. I'll accept your representations.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: The first, your Honor, is
Mr. Castro's AIDS. He has been sort of up and down in his T
cell count and his fight against the illness. Just last month
his doctors told him that his blood count has dipped below the
sort of threshold between HIV and AIDS, and he has been getting
progressively worse I think in large part due to the stress of
this case. But I don't have those results from November. But
his doctors did tell him that recently.

Although I have a list of his medications, I don't have his current dosages and actual treatment regimen with me, so I think remanding him without all of that detail I think would actually put his health in grave jeopardy. Even though I note the BOP's position would be we can treat inmates with AIDS, I still think it would be detrimental to his health at this stage without any planning by his doctors in terms of that treatment.

THE COURT: By the way, I misspoke earlier. In describing defendant's condition, I thought he said ADD rather than AIDS.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: He said both, your Honor. He has -- when he listed his sort of mental health issues, he told you about his depression, his anxiety, his ADD. That's all sort of factored in.

But he also — and I think the fourth, fifth and sixth medications that I read are his — those are his ${\sf HIV/AIDS}$ treatments.

The more unique issue and in some ways I think the more pressing issue for why imprisonment would be really disastrous in this case has to do with Mr. Castro's prostate issues. He had prostate surgery — and this is information that I've shared with the government. He had prostate surgery. It was unsuccessful and they sort of, excuse me, to put it simply, botched the surgery.

Shortly before his arrest in this case, he underwent sort of a surgery that was designed to repair some of the damage that was done to his prostate, and there was a device implanted near his prostate called a sling, which is sort of what it sounds like. And I have a sort of writeup on it which I can hand up to the Court --

THE COURT: No. That's all right. I will take your representation.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: It is designed to sort of support him internally because he was having bladder control issues, leakage, things like that. The sling also

Plea

malfunctioned, and when he underwent surgery shortly before his arrest --

That was the surgery right before, right?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: -- to remove it, it turned out that his own skin actually had grown around this device that was implanted so they couldn't remove it. So now he has this device in him that pulls painfully and uncomfortably and that can't be removed because his own body has sort of grown around it.

The issues of incontinence, bladder control, not to mention the pain, all persist. And I think not only would that make the conditions of confinement generally more harsh than will be necessary to achieve the statutory sentencing objectives, I think it also makes him very vulnerable in prison. I mean, in terms of -- you know, his HIV/AIDS alone, but the incontinence and that sort of constant need for medical issues I think really will present a situation where he will be quite vulnerable in prison. And I think, under Section 3553(a), that will be a very powerful reason based on his history and characteristics for the Court to vary from the guideline range.

Again, I can give the Court more details about it if the Court wants, but those are the two sort of particular to Mr. Castro's health, the two exceptional circumstances that I

think not only will support a nonjail sentence in the end but at this stage of the case counsel against remand and really do make this an exceptional case.

And when you combine that with the Attorney General's position and, quite frankly, Mr. Castro's performance on bail, you know, when you think about the regular bail circumstances -- he is not a risk of flight. He doesn't pose a danger to the community. He has several times -- actually, I think, three or four times been granted permission first by a magistrate judge and then by this Court to travel to Florida to see his mother, to Boston to see his brother. He actually just got back yesterday, I think. He was in Boston for Thanksgiving. He knew what was coming today, you know, and he has made every court appearance, every appointment in our office.

So in light of all of those circumstances, I would ask that his bail be continued.

THE COURT: OK. Mr. Williams, does the government want to be heard on it?

MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, just very briefly.

I will say that Ms. Cross-Goldenberg has been throughout this case very candid with our office about Mr. Castro's health issues. They have been heavily documented. They have been reviewed by not only myself but my supervisors. So we are very much aware of the problems that she laid out to

the Court, and I can just give the Court assurance that they have all been documented to us as well.

This is not a case where a defendant has some medical problems, a case where he has some significant ones. The government has been comfortable with him being on bail.

And to the extent the Court is considering not imposing a sentence of imprisonment, the government certainly would not seek remand as a result of that possibility.

And just briefly, without getting into the, you know, whether or not any term of imprisonment is deserved here, because that is for a later date, I will point out that Ms. Cross-Goldenberg is correct that Mr. Castro qualified for relief under what's referred to as the Holder memo in light of his conduct in this case, and, in addition to his conduct that has qualified him for Holder relief, his health concerns are a separate and independently significant matter which I think inform the totality of the circumstances when your Honor is considering whether exceptional circumstances exist to excuse remand at this point.

THE COURT: OK. Well, I appreciate your being forthcoming, Mr. Williams, with the government's position.

And there is a more than adequate showing of exceptional circumstances that I will not remand the defendant. The defendant is not a risk of flight or a danger to the community and there are exceptional circumstances.

24

25

government.

Thank you.

Plea So sentencing is fixed for March the 14th at 10 a.m. 1 2 We have to give more time because the defendant is on 3 bail. So sentence is April 18th at 10 a.m. 4 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: My calendar only goes to March but I think April 18th sounds good to me. Thank you, your 5 6 Honor. 7 THE COURT: OK. If there is a problem, please let me 8 know and we can adjust the date. 9 I'd ask for defense submissions at least 14 days 10 before sentence and government submission at least eight days 11 before sentence. All right? 12 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Of course, your Honor. 13 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor. 14 And I will provide the Court with the documentation 15 that we had provided the government. 16 THE COURT: OK. Please make sure to get it to me, you 17 know, 14 days before sentence and eight days so that I have an 18 opportunity to consider all of that. All right. 19 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor. 20 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. 21 THE COURT: Good afternoon, all. 22 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Oh, I am returning Court Exhibit 1 to the